


After considering these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. As this Court previously noted on October 15, 2014, in its Order denying plaintiff's first motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. #11], this case is neither factually nor legally complex. Moreover, it is evident that Plaintiff is able to present his claims, because the Court has ordered Defendants to respond to his claims. Plaintiff's bald assertions that he

believes he is entitled to redress and that he is unable to afford an attorney do not justify the appointment of counsel at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. #24] is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated this 8th day of January, 2015.



JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE